



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/798,778	03/12/2004	Richard Schiller	P-6666-US	5632

49443 7590 03/21/2007  
PEARL COHEN ZEDEK LATZER, LLP  
1500 BROADWAY 12TH FLOOR  
NEW YORK, NY 10036

EXAMINER
----------

DESIR, JEAN WICEL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2622

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/21/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/798,778

Applicant(s)

SCHILLER, RICHARD

Examiner

Jean W. Désir

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.  |

Art Unit: 2622

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Specification*

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-4, 8, 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Terry (US 5,546,131).

#### **Claim 1:**

Terry discloses:

A method of displaying a video signal together with associated information (see Figs. 1a-1f, 2) comprising transforming the video from a first scanning raster to a second scanning raster having a different aspect ratio from the first, the transformation providing compensation for the aspect ratio change, and the transformed video occupying only part of the second scanning raster (see col. 1 lines 33-40); and using some or all of the unoccupied part of the second raster to display the associated

Art Unit: 2622

information (see Figs. 1a-1f, where the Subtitles are considered as the associated information as claimed).

**Claim 2** is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 3, 4 are disclosed, see col. 2 line 32, col. 1 lines 34-39.

**Claims 8, 9** are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 5-7, 11, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terry (US 5,546,131) in view of Kim et al (US 6,788,347).

Claim 5:

Terry does not explicitly say that the first raster is a **high-definition raster** and the second raster is a **standard definition raster**, as claimed in claim 5; however, as pointed out above, Terry teaches conversion (transformation) between a first raster and a second raster, and it is notoriously well known in the art to convert a high definition raster to a standard definition raster -as evidence see Kim at col. 1 lines 14-40, the ABSTRACT, where through a downconversion, high definition raster is transformed to standard definition raster- in order to output video in different format or aspect ratio; because of these teachings, an artisan would be motivated to combine the references to

Art Unit: 2622

arrive at the claimed invention, for purpose of obtaining video in different format or aspect ratio. Therefore, the claimed invention would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

**Claim 6** is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1, 5; as pointed out in the rejection of claim 5, Kim teaches downconversion.

Claim 7 is disclosed, see Terry at Figs. 1a-1f where the displayed information (Subtitles) can be changed through control input.

**Claim 11** is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1, 5, and 6.

Claim 12 is disclosed, see Terry at col. 5 line 45 to col. 6 line 7.

6. Claims 10, 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terry (US 5,546,131) in view of Saeger et al (US 5,345,270).

**Claim 10:**

Terry discloses all the claimed limitations in claim 10 as already pointed out in claim 1; except Terry does not explicitly teach associating a **monitoring signal** as claimed in claim 10, however Terry does teach associating information (like subtitles) with the video signal, and the reference to Saeger shows that associating monitoring signal, like storm warnings, news alerts, and other useful messages/information, and displaying them on the unoccupied part of the second raster, is a notoriously well known technique in the art (as evidence see Saeger at col. 1 lines 40-44, col. 5 lines 43-45, Figs. 2, 3). Because of these teachings, an artisan would be motivated to combine the references to arrive at the claimed invention, and provide associated monitoring signal

Art Unit: 2622

and other useful messages/information. Therefore, the claimed invention would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

**Claims 13-16** are rejected for the same reasons as claim 10; because the reference to Saeger teaches that borders or unoccupied part of the display can be used to display different types of auxiliary information, see Saeger at col. 1 lines 40-51, col. 5 lines 13-14, 43-45, col. 8 line 13, these different types of auxiliary information and other useful information are considered to be included "control information" as claimed in claims 13-16.

7. Claims 17, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terry (US 5,546,131) in view of Saeger et al (US 5,345,270) and the Background of the instant application.

**Claims 17, 18:**

The above combination as stated in the rejection of claim 10 disclosed all the limitations of claims 17 and 18; except that a plurality of video signals from different sources/inputs and an array of monitors are not explicitly disclosed as claimed in claims 17 and 18; however, the reference to Saeger teaches a system where station and/or network logos are also involved (see Saeger at col. 1 line 43, col. 5 line 14), this network environment would suggest to an artisan different sources/inputs and outputs/monitors, and the Background of the instant application discussed this suggestion (see Background of the instant application, page 1 lines 13-29); thus implementing the above combination in a network environment where different

sources/inputs and outputs/monitors are involved would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made.

### **Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jean W. Désir whose telephone number is (571) 272 7344. The examiner can normally be reached on 5/4/9 - First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David L. Ometz can be reached on (571) 272 7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

**JWD**  
**Mar. 16, 07**



DAVID OMETZ  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER